STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS FILED (FOR MERCHANTS WHO ALSO OPT OUT) N CLERK'S OFFICE US DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.

	TED STATES DISTRICT COURT TERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	osmo	1720	*	MAR 28	2013	*
FEE A	PAYMENT CARD INTERCHANGE AND MERCHANT DISCOUNT TRUST LITIGATION		No. 05	gromm	NOKLYN	(1 <u>6</u>)	IVE
Stater	ment of Objections	, A			AP	R C	2013
I am a <i>Merch</i>	a member of the plaintiff class in the cathant Discount Antitrust Litigation. I at	ase called <i>In</i> m a class me	<i>re Paymen</i> mber becaı	t Carde	HAVIOLETISM erate [biism	86F.86 less name	IDI CHE GLE
and add	ress] SONIC DILVE IN of PARAGOLI	16 4711 W.	Kingshig.	hurry	PARAgon	Id Ar	272450
and I	have accepted Visa and/or MasterCard	i from [approxi	mate date]	JuNE 2	2004		
	"present," or approximate date]PIESEN +						
	ct to the settlement in this lawsuit. My	v reasons for	objecting a	are:			
 2. 	The proposed settlement does not ad interchange rates for the banks, the s settlement actually validates that pra illegally fix fees for the banks that m pay. Our portion of the compensator interchange, and given that Visa and can recoup the settlement amount by Instead of addressing the core claims merchants with a limited ability to su transactions that is of little value to u	subject of the actice, enablir nerchants and ry relief amore MasterCard raising interest in the case, urcharge Visans.	core claiming Visa and their custo unts to only can continuous rehange rate the settlema and Master.	s in the I Master omers had a fract ue to fix es in the ent mer er Card of	case. The Card to cave no che ion of what interchase future. The cardinate c	e propontinuoice but the mat we nge, the des	ue to ut to pay in ney
3.	[If merchant operates in one of the ten state. OK and TX] We operate stores in the state(s) of _ which prohibit surcharging of credit relief is of no value to us.	ARKAN.	iAI				
4.	[If merchant accepts American Express] W settlement limits our ability to surchabecause under its terms we can only also surcharge American Express transactions under our contractions transactions under our contractions can be cannot take advantage of the surchabete.	arge Visa and surcharge Vinsactions. He act with Ame to avoid this	l MasterCa isa and Mas lowever, w erican Expi limitation,	rd credisterCarde canno ress. Sin this is a	t card transactit surchargace we cannother re	nsactions if ge Am annot	we erican

- 5. The proposed settlement includes unacceptable obligations, such as requiring us to disclose to customers at the point of sale that we are imposing the surcharge, when in fact the only reason we would charge such fees is the onerous fees set by Visa and MasterCard. The settlement also requires us to disclose to Visa and MasterCard that we are imposing the surcharge, which is an effort to intimidate us.
- The release will not allow me to protect against mistreatment by Visa and MasterCard. It purports to cover all Visa and MasterCard rules and conduct that were in place upon preliminary approval, and all future rules and future conduct that are substantially similar to rules and conduct in place at preliminary approval. These rules are unfair and cause problems for my business.
- 7. Based on the outcome of the settlement, we do not believe the lawyers who negotiated it represented our best interests.

My personal informati	on is:		
Name [first, middle, last]: CARHON Keith Bryson			
Address:	5404 Wood bury Cové Paragould AR 72450		
Phone No.:	870 335 5202		
[If your own lawyer is representing	ng you with respect to the settlement] The contact information for my lawyer is:		
Dated:	3.23.2013		
Signed:	Line By		
Printed name:	Keith Bryson		
Merchant name:	Some of Pargental		
Address:	Paragonal An 72450		
-	Paragonal An 72450		

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS (FOR MERCHANTS WHO ALSO OPT OUT)

	TED STATES DISTRICT COURT TERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
In re FEE	PAYMENT CARD INTERCHANGE AND MERCHANT DISCOUNT ITRUST LITIGATION	: : No. 05-MD-01720 (JG) (JO)
State	ment of Objections	X
Merc	-	called In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and class member because I operate [business name]
	have accepted Visa and/or MasterCard fro	
	["present," or approximate date] PITSEN F	,
I obj	ect to the settlement in this lawsuit. My rea	asons for objecting are:
 2. 	interchange rates for the banks, the subject settlement actually validates that practic illegally fix fees for the banks that merchange. Our portion of the compensatory reinterchange, and given that Visa and Macan recoup the settlement amount by raise	ss Visa's and MasterCard's price-fixing of ect of the core claims in the case. The proposed e, enabling Visa and MasterCard to continue to hants and their customers have no choice but to elief amounts to only a fraction of what we pay in asterCard can continue to fix interchange, they sing interchange rates in the future. the case, the settlement merely provides
2 .	merchants with a limited ability to surch transactions that is of little value to us.	
3.	OK and TX] We operate stores in the state(s) of	nt prohibit surcharging: CA, CO, CT, FL, KS, ME, MA, NY, MR, MR, MR, MR, MR, MR, MR, MR, MR, MR
4.	[If merchant accepts American Express] We as settlement limits our ability to surcharge because under its terms we can only sure also surcharge American Express transactions under our contract	ccept American Express transactions. The Visa and MasterCard credit card transactions charge Visa and MasterCard transactions if we ctions. However, we cannot surcharge American with American Express. Since we cannot woid this limitation, this is another reason why ging relief in the settlement.

- The proposed settlement includes unacceptable obligations, such as requiring us to disclose to customers at the point of sale that we are imposing the surcharge, when in fact the only reason we would charge such fees is the onerous fees set by Visa and MasterCard. The settlement also requires us to disclose to Visa and MasterCard that we are imposing the surcharge, which is an effort to intimidate us.
- 6. The release will not allow me to protect against mistreatment by Visa and MasterCard. It purports to cover all Visa and MasterCard rules and conduct that were in place upon preliminary approval, and all future rules and future conduct that are substantially similar to rules and conduct in place at preliminary approval. These rules are unfair and cause problems for my business.
- 7. Based on the outcome of the settlement, we do not believe the lawyers who negotiated it represented our best interests.

My personal informati	on is:
Name [first, middle, last]:	CARlton Reith Bryson
Address:	5404 Wordbury Cove Paragould AN 12450
Phone No.:	870 335 520-
[If your own lawyer is representi	ng you with respect to the settlement] The contact information for my lawyer is:
Dated:	3-23-2013
Signed:	Kind By
Printed name:	Keith Bryson
Merchant name:	Sovic of Bond
Address:	10314 Huy 63 N BONO AR 72116

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS (FOR MERCHANTS WHO ALSO OPT OUT)

	TED STATES DISTRICT COURT TERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
FEE	PAYMENT CARD INTERCHANGE AND MERCHANT DISCOUNT ITRUST LITIGATION	:	No. 05-MD-01720 (JG) (JO)
State	ment of Objections	X	
	a member of the plaintiff class in the case contains Discount Antitrust Litigation. I am a contain the case of the plaintiff class in the case of the case of the plaintiff class in the case of the plaintiff class in the case of the case o		,
and ad	dress] SONICOT JUNESDIO 4405 E.	Johns	ON AV. Jonesburg AR 72401
and I	have accepted Visa and/or MasterCard from	n [approxir	mate date] July 2006
	["present," or approximate date] PrtStat		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
I obje	ect to the settlement in this lawsuit. My reas	sons for	objecting are:
2.	The proposed settlement does not address interchange rates for the banks, the subject settlement actually validates that practice illegally fix fees for the banks that merch pay. Our portion of the compensatory relinterchange, and given that Visa and Mass can recoup the settlement amount by raising Instead of addressing the core claims in the merchants with a limited ability to surchattransactions that is of little value to us.	ct of the , enablir ants and ief amouterCarding inter he case, arge Visa	core claims in the case. The proposed ng Visa and MasterCard to continue to their customers have no choice but to unts to only a fraction of what we pay in can continue to fix interchange, they change rates in the future. the settlement merely provides a and MasterCard credit card
3.	[If merchant operates in one of the ten states that OK and TX]		
	We operate stores in the state(s) ofwhich prohibit surcharging of credit card relief is of no value to us.	transact	nons. Because of this law, the principal
4.	[If merchant accepts American Express] We accessettlement limits our ability to surcharge because under its terms we can only surcharge also surcharge American Express transactions under our contract we realistically drop American Express to away we cannot take advantage of the surcharge	Visa and harge Vitions. However the House	I MasterCard credit card transactions is a and MasterCard transactions if we lowever, we cannot surcharge American erican Express. Since we cannot limitation, this is another reason why

- 5. The proposed settlement includes unacceptable obligations, such as requiring us to disclose to customers at the point of sale that we are imposing the surcharge, when in fact the only reason we would charge such fees is the onerous fees set by Visa and MasterCard. The settlement also requires us to disclose to Visa and MasterCard that we are imposing the surcharge, which is an effort to intimidate us.
- 6. The release will not allow me to protect against mistreatment by Visa and MasterCard. It purports to cover all Visa and MasterCard rules and conduct that were in place upon preliminary approval, and all future rules and future conduct that are substantially similar to rules and conduct in place at preliminary approval. These rules are unfair and cause problems for my business.
- 7. Based on the outcome of the settlement, we do not believe the lawyers who negotiated it represented our best interests.

My personal information	on is:
Name [first, middle, last]:	Carlow Ke.M. Bryson
Address:	5404 Wridbury Cove PARAgente AN 72450
Phone No.:	870 3355202
[If your own lawyer is representin	g you with respect to the settlement] The contact information for my lawyer is:
Dated:	3-23-2013
Signed:	Lind By
Printed name:	Keith Brysn
Merchant name:	Somic of Jonesboro
Address:	4405 E. Johnson AV
-	Jonesbord AR 72401

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS (FOR MERCHANTS WHO ALSO OPT OUT)

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
In re PAYMENT CARD INTERCHANGE FEE AND MERCHANT DISCOUNT ANTITRUST LITIGATION	x : : No. 05-MD-01720 (JG) (JO)
Statement of Objections	X
I am a member of the plaintiff class in the case Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation. I am a	e called In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and a class member because I operate [business name]
and address] Scoll of Portage ville 160 Hm	4 162 Portagerille MO 63873
and I have accepted Visa and/or MasterCard fr	·
until ["present," or approximate date]	·
I object to the settlement in this lawsuit. My re	easons for objecting are:
interchange rates for the banks, the subject settlement actually validates that practice illegally fix fees for the banks that meropay. Our portion of the compensatory reinterchange, and given that Visa and Macan recoup the settlement amount by rail Instead of addressing the core claims in merchants with a limited ability to surely transactions that is of little value to us. [If merchant operates in one of the ten states the OK and TX] We operate stores in the state(s) of which prohibit surcharging of credit care relief is of no value to us. [If merchant accepts American Express] We assettlement limits our ability to surcharge.	the case, the settlement merely provides
also surcharge American Express transa Express transactions under our contract	actions. However, we cannot surcharge American with American Express. Since we cannot avoid this limitation, this is another reason why

- 5. The proposed settlement includes unacceptable obligations, such as requiring us to disclose to customers at the point of sale that we are imposing the surcharge, when in fact the only reason we would charge such fees is the onerous fees set by Visa and MasterCard. The settlement also requires us to disclose to Visa and MasterCard that we are imposing the surcharge, which is an effort to intimidate us.
- 6. The release will not allow me to protect against mistreatment by Visa and MasterCard. It purports to cover all Visa and MasterCard rules and conduct that were in place upon preliminary approval, and all future rules and future conduct that are substantially similar to rules and conduct in place at preliminary approval. These rules are unfair and cause problems for my business.
- 7. Based on the outcome of the settlement, we do not believe the lawyers who negotiated it represented our best interests.

My personal informa	tion is:	
Name [first, middle, last];	Carlen Keith Brysn	
Address:	5404 Woodbury Cove PARgould And 72450	
Phone No.:	870 335 5202	
[If your own lawyer is represent	ting you with respect to the settlement] The contact information for my lawyer is:	
Dated:	323-2013	
Signed:	Kind By	
Printed name:	Kerth Brysin	
Merchant name:	Some of Portagenile	
Address:	160 E. Starke they 162	
	Partage villa Mo 63873	